

## CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Lily Kim	Team: Squad #6	CCRB Case #: 202003054	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Thursday, 04/23/2020 9:00 PM, Tuesday, 07/27/2021 12:00 AM	Location of Incident: § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]	Precinct: 34	18 Mo. SOL 10/23/2021	EO SOL 5/4/2022	
Date/Time CV Reported Fri, 04/24/2020 3:05 PM	CV Reported At: IAB	How CV Reported: In-person	Date/Time Received at CCRB Mon, 05/04/2020 11:09 AM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. POM Craig Zimmer	19974	960080	034 PCT
2. SGT Matthew Pena	4993	933160	109 PCT
3. LT Tancredo Contreras	00000	943103	VED ZN1

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. POF Arianny Bernabel	21126	967772	034 PCT
2. POM Daniel Martinucci	20408	955140	034 PCT
3. POM Roopram Tirlokhi	10539	962136	034 PCT
4. POM Shelby Hernandez	11860	956733	034 PCT
5. POM Alex Tegan	09383	963819	034 PCT
6. SGT Juan Flores	01332	945725	044 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POM Craig Zimmer	Abuse: At § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] in Manhattan, Police Officer Craig Zimmer threatened to damage § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] property.	[REDACTED]
B.SGT Matthew Pena	Discourtesy: At § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] in Manhattan, Sergeant Matthew Pena spoke discourteously to An individual.	[REDACTED]
C.LT Tancredo Contreras	Abuse: At § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] in Manhattan, Lieutenant Tancredo Contreras threatened to damage § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] property.	[REDACTED]
D.LT Tancredo Contreras	Discourtesy: At § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] in Manhattan, Lieutenant Tancredo Contreras spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
E.LT Tancredo Contreras	Abuse: Lieutenant Tancredo Contreras entered § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] in Manhattan.	[REDACTED]
F.SGT Matthew Pena	Discourtesy: At the 73rd Precinct stationhouse, Sergeant Matthew Pena spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
G.LT Tancredo Contreras	Discourtesy: At the 73rd Precinct stationhouse, Lieutenant Tancredo Contreras spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
H.LT Tancredo Contreras	Untruthful Stmt.: Lieutenant Tancredo Contreras provided a misleading official statement to the CCRB.	[REDACTED]

## Case Summary

On April 24, 2020, § 87(2)(b) called IAB to report this complaint. On May 4, 2020, IAB Log § 87(2)(b) was received at the CCRB.

On April 23, 2020 at approximately 9:00 p.m., § 87(2)(b) and an individual walked to § 87(2)(b) located at § 87(2)(b) in Manhattan, which is owned by his girlfriend, § 87(2)(b) to get something. As § 87(2)(b) approached § 87(2)(b) PO Juan Flores and PO Craig Zimmer of the 34<sup>th</sup> Precinct drove up in a vehicle, exited, and asked § 87(2)(b) and the individual what they were doing. § 87(2)(b) refused to open the door to the business and PO Zimmer threatened to “rip the door down” (**Allegation A—Abuse of Authority**, § 87(2)(g)). At some point, additional officers arrived, including Lieutenant Tancredo Contreras and Detective Matthew Pena of the 34<sup>th</sup> Precinct. Det. Pena said, “You’re full of shit,” to the individual (**Allegation B—Discourtesy**, § 87(2)(g)). Lt. Contreras threatened to break down the door (**Allegation C—Abuse of Authority**, § 87(2)(g)). § 87(2)(b) informed the officers which key opened the door. Lt. Contreras stated, “We’re on a fucking mission with this guy” (**Allegation D—Discourtesy**, § 87(2)(g)). Lt. Contreras supervised an entry into the location (**Allegation E—Abuse of Authority**, § 87(2)(g)). After the officers completed their search and closed up the business, § 87(2)(b) was taken to the stationhouse. At the stationhouse, Lt. Contreras stated, “I’m a fucking lieutenant,” and that he did not “give a fuck” to § 87(2)(b) (**Allegation F—Discourtesy**, § 87(2)(g)). Det. Pena asked, “You want to keep playing this bullshit game?” and called § 87(2)(b) “stupid” (**Allegation G—Discourtesy**, § 87(2)(g)). § 87(2)(b) was issued summons § 87(2)(b) for violation of mayoral emergency executive order.

Lt. Tancredo Contreras provided a misleading official statement to the CCRB (**Allegation H—Untruthful statement**, § 87(2)(g)).

Body-worn camera footage of this incident was obtained. No surveillance footage of this incident was obtained, as the business was closed, and it is unknown if they had cameras.

## Findings and Recommendations

**Allegation A: At § 87(2)(b) in Manhattan, PO Craig Zimmer threatened to damage § 87(2)(b) property.**

**Allegation C: At § 87(2)(b) in Manhattan, Lieutenant Tancredo Contreras threatened to damage § 87(2)(b) property.**

**Allegation E: Lieutenant Tancredo Contreras entered § 87(2)(b) in Manhattan.**

At the 2:48 mark in PO Zimmer’s BWC (**BR 01**), PO Zimmer tells § 87(2)(b) to open the door. § 87(2)(b) asks for one second and PO Zimmer states, “I’ll rip the door down.” At the 5:22 mark, PO Zimmer says that if § 87(2)(b) will not open the door, the officers will.

At the 4:30 mark in Lt. Contreras’ BWC (**BR 02**), Lt. Contreras states, “Now we’re going to break the door.”

At the 6:01 mark in Det. Pena’s BWC (**BR 03**), Det. Pena unlocks the door. Lt. Contreras enters, and Det. Pena enters behind him. Lt. Contreras turns on the lights, which were off. Det. Pena walks toward the back of the salon with a flashlight in hand, which he points down the staircase which is about halfway into the salon. At the 6:30 mark, Det. Pena asks Lt. Contreras if he wants him to take

a look and walks downstairs to the basement, which is empty. At the 6:55 mark, Det. Pena opens a door to a storage room. He checks another door in the opposite corner, but it is locked from the outside. At the 7:16 mark, Det. Pena walks back upstairs. At the 8:03 mark, Det. Pena turns off the lights and exits the salon.

§ 87(2)(b) testified (**BR 04-05**) that he walked toward § 87(2)(b) located at § 87(2)(b) in Manhattan, which is owned by his girlfriend, § 87(2)(b) to get his bag of tools which he previously lent to § 87(2)(b). In front of the salon, PO Zimmer and PO Flores approached § 87(2)(b) and asked what he was doing. § 87(2)(b) told the officers that he had the keys to the business in his pocket and that he was not breaking in. Approximately twelve additional officers arrived, including Det. Pena and Lt. Contreras. § 87(2)(b) was handcuffed sometime after speaking with the other officers, including Lt. Contreras. The officers continued to tell § 87(2)(b) to open the door to the business and he refused. Two officers, identified by the investigation as Lt. Contreras and PO Zimmer, threatened to break down the door and stated that § 87(2)(b) would have to pay for a broken door if he did not cooperate. Lt. Contreras took the keys out of his pocket and used them to open the business. Officers entered the business. § 87(2)(b) stood by the curb and then was placed in a police vehicle, so he did not know what the officers did inside.

During his interview, § 87(2)(b) stated that there were no witnesses present, but during a follow up call he confirmed that an electrician was with him. § 87(2)(b) refused to identify him or provide his contact information.

PO Zimmer testified (**BR 06**) that Sgt. Delgado instructed him and PO Flores to check on a nail salon located at § 87(2)(b) in Manhattan in response to multiple complaints over the past week that had come in that the business was open. Upon arrival, PO Zimmer and PO Flores observed that the business door was locked, but the metal gate was partially open. PO Zimmer and PO Flores closed the gate and remained in the area to ensure no one entered. The glass windows were covered by “cardboard paper,” so the officers could not see into the building or see if lights were on. No one was inside the business. Less than an hour later, § 87(2)(b) and an individual arrived at the location. PO Zimmer and PO Flores were alerted to their arrival when § 87(2)(b) opened the metal gate. No other individuals entered or exited the location until § 87(2)(b) arrived. PO Zimmer and PO Flores approached § 87(2)(b) and asked what they were doing there. § 87(2)(b) stated that he had the keys and that he was there to do some work on the building but did not specify further. § 87(2)(b) refused to allow the officers to enter, so PO Zimmer called Lt. Contreras to respond. PO Zimmer initially testified that he did not threaten to “rip the door down,” and after the BWC was shown, stated that he did not remember making the statement or why he made it. If § 87(2)(b) was uncooperative even after Lt. Contreras arrived, Lt. Contreras would have to decide whether the door had to be forcibly opened.

The investigation determined that PO Flores’ statement was not necessary for an affirmative disposition in this case.

Lt. Contreras testified (**BR 07**) that in the days leading up to the incident, he was aware of at least five 311 calls regarding § 87(2)(b) in Manhattan. The reports all came within a period of approximately one week from § 87(2)(b) a resident of the building. She stated that employees continued to operate the beauty salon located at the ground level of her building, in violation of the mayoral executive emergency order. Because there were multiple reports, Lt. Contreras contacted her directly and told her to report anything directly to him, since he can dispatch someone out there faster than if she called through 311. Lt. Contreras did not know if there were any records of the calls between § 87(2)(b) and his Department phone and he did not have

written documentation of the calls he had with § 87(2)(b). Lt. Contreras likely asked § 87(2)(b) for physical descriptions of any individuals she observed entering or operating the business, but he was unable to recall any specific descriptions provided prior to the incident date. On April 23, 2020, § 87(2)(b) called Lt. Contreras earlier in his tour and reported that she saw multiple individuals going in and out of the business and that the inside of the store was not visible because the windows were covered with brown paper. Lt. Contreras ordered PO Flores and PO Zimmer to the location to report anything they observed. The officers reported to Lt. Contreras that they did not see or hear anyone inside, but the metal gate was raised without a lock. This was the first sign that individuals were likely entering the location. Lt. Contreras instructed them to lower the gate and to confirm no one was inside and to knock and see if they could hear anything going on inside. Lt. Contreras instructed the officers continue patrolling in the immediate vicinity, and to report anything else to him. A few hours later, § 87(2)(b) called again and reported that she observed an individual who she described as a dark-complexioned, heavyset male § 87(2)(b) walking in and out of the business with one other individual. PO Flores and PO Zimmer returned to the location. The gate was up again, and § 87(2)(b) was trying to unlock the door to enter. PO Flores and PO Zimmer called Lt. Contreras and reported that they stopped two individuals who were about to enter the business. Lt. Contreras responded and observed the business' gate up, the door to the business locked, and the lights on inside. Lt. Contreras was not able to see anything in the business, but as it was nighttime, the lights were visible through the paper in contrast to the other businesses that had the lights off. Other than the lights that were on, there were no other signs that anyone was inside the business. Lt. Contreras asked § 87(2)(b) to open the door for the officers so they can confirm whether individuals were working inside, but § 87(2)(b) refused. Lt. Contreras' understanding was that repair or maintenance employees were permitted to work on locations as long as the business was not operating or accepting customers. However, based on § 87(2)(b) description of people entering and leaving, it did not seem like a simple maintenance job. Due to § 87(2)(b) description, Lt. Contreras felt it was necessary to enter the business and confirm whether or not there were individuals inside, as he had a recent experience when he locked and left a location only to receive 911 calls sometime later with individuals reporting that they were locked at the location. Lt. Contreras handcuffed § 87(2)(b) with the assistance of his officers and obtained the keys from § 87(2)(b). Lt. Contreras did not know if the officers made any other attempts to enter the business such as knocking on the door. Lt. Contreras initially stated that he did not threaten to break down the door to § 87(2)(b) but upon reviewing BWC, Lt. Contreras confirmed that he made the statement, "I will break the door on you." Lt. Contreras explained that he was going to get ESU to forcibly enter the business if § 87(2)(b) did not ultimately cooperate.

The investigation obtained two 311 call reports (**BR 08**) related to this incident. On April 20, 2020 at 8:00 p.m., § 87(2)(b) was generated when § 87(2)(b) reported that § 87(2)(b) was operating at the time of her call and put paper on the windows so no one could see that they were operating. The job was finalized as 10-91 - Non-Crime Corrected at 8:27 p.m. On April 17, 2020 at 11:12 a.m., § 87(2)(b) was generated when § 87(2)(b) made the same report as the above, with the added detail that the business operated on April 16, 2020 and April 17, 2020. The job was finalized as 10-90X - unfounded at 12:50 p.m. The police department responded and observed no evidence of the violation at the time.

Effective March 21, 2020 at 8:00 p.m. and until further notice, all barbershops, hair salons, tattoo or piercing parlors and providers of related personal care services will be closed to members of the public. This shall also include nail technicians, cosmetologists and estheticians, and the provision of electrolysis, laser hair removal services, as these services cannot be provided while maintaining social distance, Mayoral Emergency Executive Order No. 102. All businesses and not-for-profit entities in the City shall utilize, to the maximum extent possible, any telecommuting or work from home procedures that they can safely utilize. Each such business and not-for-profit entity shall

reduce its in-person workforce at any locations by 100%, Mayoral Emergency Executive Order No. 103, (BR 09). The Court of Appeals formulated a three-prong test for determining whether the police are presented with an emergency situation that justifies a warrantless intrusion into a protected area: 1) The police must have reasonable grounds to believe that there is an emergency at hand and an immediate need for their assistance for the protection of life or property, 2) The search must not be primarily motivated by intent to arrest and seize evidence, 3) There must some reasonable basis, approximating probable cause, to associate the emergency with the area or place to be searched, People v. Rodriguez, 77 A.D.3d 280 (2010) **(BR 10)**. A sign posted at the entrance to the premises, in conjunction with an unlocked door, indicates a manifest invitation to the public to enter and a voluntary relinquishment of an expectation of privacy on the part of the occupant. Absent any of these elements, however, a person who makes certain premises their primary place of residence, posts no signs and shuts their door to the public should not be deemed to have relinquished their expectations of privacy by conducting a private commercial enterprise within, People v. Smith, 125 Misc. 2d 782 (1984) **(BR 11)**.

It is undisputed that § 87(2)(b) was reported on multiple occasions that it was operating during lockdown. The investigation found records for two 311 call reports from § 87(2)(b) but Lt. Contreras reported that there were additional complaints both from § 87(2)(b) and anonymous callers. The two 311 calls were closed as unfounded and non-crime corrected by the police department. § 87(2)(b) was closed and locked at the time when § 87(2)(b) approached, and the owner was not present. § 87(2)(b) did have the keys, but he did not consent to the officers' entry. Although a business may be entered by officers during operating hours, the door was locked and the business was closed to the public. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b). Lt. Contreras stated that the entry was necessary to confirm whether individuals were inside, because in a previous incident, individuals were locked in a location that Lt. Contreras left. Although Lt. Contreras testified that the lights were on inside and visible through the brown paper covering the windows, BWC and PO Zimmer's testimony discredit this statement. PO Zimmer further testified that there were no signs that anyone was inside, and he did not observe any individuals approach or exit the location until § 87(2)(b) arrived. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b). The door was locked, the lights were off, and § 87(2)(b) reports were the only reason to believe that anyone was inside when § 87(2)(b) first approached. However, even if § 87(2)(b) reported that individuals entered and left the business earlier in the evening, PO Zimmer stated that he did not observe anyone for the duration that he and PO Flores remained in the vicinity. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

**Allegation B: At § 87(2)(b) in Manhattan, Detective Matthew Pena spoke discourteously to an individual.**

**Allegation D: At § 87(2)(b) in Manhattan, Lieutenant Tancredo Contreras spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)**

**Allegation F: At the 34th Precinct stationhouse, Lieutenant Tancredo Contreras spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)**

**Allegation G: At the 34th Precinct stationhouse, Detective Matthew Pena spoke discourteously to § 87(2)(b)**

At the 2:32 mark in Det. Pena's BWC, Det. Pena tells an individual, "You're full of shit," and walks away.

At the 6:03 mark in Lt. Contreras' BWC, Lt. Contreras says, "We're on a fucking mission with this guy." Based on BWC, he is within earshot of § 87(2)(b) as he makes the statement after taking a few steps away from § 87(2)(b).

At the 11:05 mark in PO Arianny Bernabel's BWC (**BR 12**), Lt. Contreras tells § 87(2)(b) that he cannot do whatever he wants just because his brother is a sergeant. At the 11:15 mark, Lt. Contreras states, "I'm a fucking lieutenant." At the 11:34 mark, Lt. Contreras states, "I don't give a fuck who he is." At the 13:16 mark, Det. Pena tells § 87(2)(b) "You want to keep playing this bullshit game, you know what we're going to do now?" At the 14:00 mark, Det. Pena says, "Stupid," to § 87(2)(b).

Det. Pena testified (**BR 13**) that during the incident, he interacted with an individual who identified himself as an electrician. Det. Pena asked basic investigative questions such as where his tools were and who hired him. The individual stated that his tools were in his truck, which was parked at his home. Det. Pena asked how he was going to work without his tools, and the individual responded that § 87(2)(b) was going to "show him a job." This seemed to be misleading, so Det. Pena was suspicious about his presence there. Det. Pena told the individual that he was "full of shit" because his answers were misleading and seemed to be covering something up. Det. Pena did not remember if he stated, "You want to play this bullshit game, you know what we're going to do now?" or if he called § 87(2)(b) "Stupid." After reviewing BWC, Det. Pena confirmed that he used the phrase "bullshit game," but was unable to hear himself use the word, "stupid." Det. Pena used the phrase "bullshit game" because § 87(2)(b) was probably saying something to the effect of, "I wasn't doing anything."

Lt. Contreras initially stated that he did not remember if he said, "We're on a fucking mission with this guy," in reference to § 87(2)(b) but confirmed that he made the statement after reviewing BWC. At the 42:06 mark in the interview, Lt. Contreras explained that he was not near § 87(2)(b) at the time, but he did not remember from his independent recollection how far away § 87(2)(b) was when he made this statement. After reviewing the BWC again, Lt. Contreras estimated that he was approximately five feet away from § 87(2)(b) when he made the statement. At the stationhouse, § 87(2)(b) kept stating that his brother was a member of the police force and Lt. Contreras responded that he did not "give a fuck" who he knew "on the job" (in the police department), because he was not going to show him favoritism when he broke the law. Lt. Contreras did not remember if he stated that he was a "fucking lieutenant," but after reviewing the BWC, he was able to confirm that he made the statement. Lt. Contreras used profanity because he was not going to give § 87(2)(b) special treatment just because his brother was a member of service.

The Department is committed to accomplishing its mission of protecting the lives and property of all citizens of New York City by treating every citizen with compassion, courtesy, professionalism, and respect, while efficiently rendering police services and enforcing the laws impartially, by fighting crime both through deterrence and the relentless pursuit of criminals, Patrol Guide Procedure 200-02 (**BR 14**). Profane remarks, made during stressful situations or while an officer is trying to get a chaotic situation under control, are not misconduct. The interaction in this case was not so chaotic that the duty of courteous and professional behavior should be overridden by the immediate need to maintain order. As such, the profanity used was unnecessary and without a legitimate police purpose, DAO-DCT Case #2017-17005 (**BR 15**). BWC captures the profanity

used by Det. Pena and Lt. Contreras, and they did not deny making these statements. Although Lt. Contreras argued that he was not within earshot of § 87(2)(b) when making the initial statement, “We’re on a fucking mission with this guy,” BWC proved otherwise and he estimated that he stood approximately five feet away. § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

**Allegation H: Lieutenant Tancredo Contreras provided a misleading official statement to the CCRB.**

Lt. Contreras made a misleading official statement when he stated that the lights were on in the business, which led him to believe that there could be people inside. BWC confirms that this was untrue.

At the 20:30 mark in Lt. Contreras’ CCRB interview, the following verbatim exchange occurred:

**Inv. Kim:** By the point that you actually arrived on scene, what was the situation with the business. Was it unlocked? Was the gate still down? What condition was it in?

**Lt. Contreras:** When I arrived at the location, the gate was up, the lights were on, and § 87(2)(b) was standing outside.

**Inv. Kim:** The lights were on. I’m sorry, I thought earlier you stated that the lady said that they had blocked the windows, is that correct? Am I remembering that right?

**Lt. Contreras:** Yes, they had paper on the window, but you could still see the light coming out when all the other businesses. You could see the light inside, you just couldn’t see inside if there was people inside or not.

At the 25:14 mark in the interview, the following verbatim exchange occurred:

**Inv. Kim:** Other than the lights that shone through that paper, were there any other signs, at that specific time, that there were individuals inside the building?

**Lt. Contreras:** No.

**Inv. Kim:** Okay, and was the female caller, § 87(2)(b) had she stated that there were individuals actually inside the building, and not describe—excluding § 87(2)(b) who was about to enter it?

**Lt. Contreras:** She told me, that I can remember, there were people going in and out of the location. And she was like, “They’re trying to go in the location now.”

At the 45:43 mark in the interview, Lt. Contreras’ BWC was played from the 6:04 mark to the 6:40 mark. At the 46:30 mark in the interview, the following verbatim exchange occurred:

**Inv. Kim:** Seeing the footage, Lt. Contreras, are the lights on in the business?

**Lt. Contreras:** No.

**Inv. Kim:** Is it—um, could you explain why you stated earlier that you were able to see the lights shining through the paper?

**Lt. Contreras:** I believed that the lights were on at the time. That’s why.

**Inv. Kim:** Okay. Um, so at this time, for some reason you believed that lights were on in the business?

**Lt. Contreras:** Correct.

**Inv. Kim:** Did any other officers confirm this observation with you or make a similar observation to you?



**Lt. Contreras:** Not that I could remember, no.

Officers are prohibited from making intentionally making misleading official statements. A misleading statement is intended to misdirect the fact finder, and materially alter the narrative. A material fact is a significant fact that a reasonable person would recognize as relevant to, or affecting, the subject matter of the issue at hand. When a member of the service is afforded an opportunity to recollect with the benefit of credible evidence, and the member makes a statement consistent with the evidence, the member's prior statement will not be considered a false statement. However, it may be considered a misleading statement, Administrative Guide 304-10 (BR 16). A sign posted at the entrance to the premises, in conjunction with an unlocked door, indicates a manifest invitation to the public to enter and a voluntary relinquishment of an expectation of privacy on the part of the occupant. Absent any of these elements, however, a person who makes certain premises their primary place of residence, posts no signs and shuts their door to the public should not be deemed to have relinquished their expectations of privacy by conducting a private commercial enterprise within, People v. Smith, 125 Misc. 2d 782 (1984).

Lt. Contreras initially testified that the lights were on in the business, and that led him to believe that individuals were inside the business which was not supposed to be operating at the time that the mayoral executive emergency order was in effect. After viewing his BWC during his interview, Lt. Contreras acknowledged that the lights were off, but held to his statement that at the time of the incident, he believed the lights were on. This is a material fact, as it could be argued that had the lights been on in the business, they could be an indication that the business was operating and/or open to the public (similar to the examples of a sign or unlocked door in People v. Smith). § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(g)

### Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- § 87(2)(b)  
[REDACTED]
- PO Zimmer has been a member-of-service for five years and has been a subject in two CCRB complaints and two allegations, neither of which were substantiated. § 87(2)(g)  
[REDACTED]
- Det. Pena has been a member-of-service for 18 years and has been a subject in seven cases and 12 allegations, of which one was substantiated:
  - Case #201607201 involved a substantiated allegation of threat to damage/seize property against Det. Pena. The Board recommended formalized training, and the NYPD imposed formalized training.
  - § 87(2)(g)  
[REDACTED]



- Lt. Contreras has been a member-of-service for 14 years and has been a subject in six cases and 13 allegations, of which two were substantiated:
  - Case #201211835 involved substantiated allegations of strip search and vehicle search against Lt. Contreras. Lt. Contreras was found guilty by the APU and the NYPD imposed a forfeiture of three vacation days.
  - § 87(2)(g) [REDACTED]

### Mediation, Civil and Criminal Histories

- § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED] declined to mediate this complaint.
- [§ 87(2)(b)] [§§ 86(1)(3)&(4)] [§ 87(2)(c)] [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- As of May 20, 2021, the NYC Office of the Comptroller has no record of a Notice of Claim being filed in regards to this complaint (**BR 19**).

Squad No.: 6

Investigator: <u>Lily Kim</u>	Investigator <u>Lily Kim</u>	<u>9/16/2021</u>
Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

Squad Leader: <u>Jessica Peña</u>	IM <u>Jessica Peña</u>	<u>9/16/2021</u>
Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

Reviewer: _____	_____	_____
Signature	Print Title & Name	Date